

Application No. 09/766,779

REMARKS**Summary of Telephone Interview Conducted February 2, 2006**

Applicants thank Examiner Patel for his time and consideration given during the telephone interview conducted February 2, 2006. During this interview, we discussed the features that distinguish the claimed invention from the documents of record. Applicants' representative explained that the documents of record, specifically, U.S. Patent No. 5,414,621 to Hough (hereinafter the "Hough" document), do not teach or suggest a plurality of client computers that each represent an entity that is different from at least one entity represented by another one of the client computers, wherein each different entity performs a different role in the valuation of a selected real estate property, as similarly recited in amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 17. Examiner Patel suggested the amended claim language and acknowledged that the claim amendments overcome the documents of record.

Pending Claims

Claims 1-12, 14-15, and 17-20 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 8, and 17 being independent. Applicants have amended Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 11, 15, 17, and 18 herein. Additionally, Applicants have canceled Claim 16 without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein. No new matter has been added.

Claim 16

In the Office Action dated October 7, 2005, the Examiner withdrew Claim 16 from consideration as allegedly being directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed. The Applicants traversed this objection in its Amendment and Response dated December 7, 2005; however, the Examiner maintained this objection in the Advisory Action mailed on January 27, 2006.

In an effort to expedite the prosecution of this application, Applicants have canceled Claim 16 without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein. However, contrary to the position adopted by the Examiner, Applicants believe that the subject matter of the Claim 16 is related to the invention as originally claimed.

Application No. 09/766,779

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a)

In the Office Action dated October 7, 2005, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-5, 15, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by the Hough document. The Examiner also rejected Claims 5-10 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over the Hough document in view of Official Notice. Applicants respectfully offer remarks to traverse these pending rejections.

In the Office Action, the Examiner again relied on the Hough document in rejecting the claims. However, as discussed in the interview, Applicants submit that the Hough document, either alone or in combination with any other document of record and/or the Examiner's Official Notice, fails to describe, teach, or suggest at least the feature of "a plurality of client computers, each coupled to the distributed computer network, wherein each of the client computers represents an entity that is different from at least one entity represented by another one of the client computers, wherein each different entity performs a different role in the valuation of a selected real estate property, wherein each of the client computers is operable to access the valuation program module operating on the property management services server to input predetermined information about the selected real estate property in support of a valuation calculation for the selected real estate property", as presently recited in independent Claim 1 and as similarly recited in independent Claims 8 and 17.

During the telephone interview, the Examiner stated that this feature overcomes the documents of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of independent Claims 1, 8, and 17.

Summary

For the reasons stated above, Applicants submit that independent Claims 1, 8, and 17 are patentable over the documents cited by the Examiner. Additionally, Claims 2-7, 9-12, 14-15, and 18-20 depend from one of the independent claims either directly or indirectly and are submitted to be patentable for similar reasons. The dependent claims also recite additional features further defining the present invention over the cited documents, and Applicants submit that the cited documents do not teach or suggest

Application No. 09/766,779

integrating those features into the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants requests separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim. Applicants have discussed only a few of the dependent claim features in detail herein.

Applicant has not addressed each specific rejection of the independent and dependent claims because Applicant submits that the independent claims are allowable over the documents of record, as discussed above. Applicant has not acquiesced to any such rejection and reserves the right to address the patentability of any additional claim features in the future.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the foregoing as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed October 7, 2005. Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and request such action.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by telephone, please call the undersigned at 404.572.4647.

Respectfully submitted,

Kerry L. Broome

Kerry L. Broome

Reg. No. 54,004

King & Spalding LLP
45th Floor
191 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
404.572.4600
K&S Docket: 21300.105004